

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 03 2006

Serial No. : 10/707,409
Applicants : Phillip J. Gilmore and Shenghong Yang
Response to : Office Action Mailed 02/03/2006
Page : 8

REMARKS

This is in response to the recent Office Action. The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration is requested.

Disposition of Claims.

Claims 1, 2-8, 10, 12-17, 22-40, 42, 43 and 46-59 were pending in the application. By this response, claims 1 and 28-59 are cancelled and new claims 60 and 61 added. Accordingly, claims 3-8, 10, 12-17, 22-27, 60 and 61 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 48 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Without acquiescing in the basis for the rejection, claims 48 and 59 are cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection is moot. Withdrawal is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 10, 40, 42, 43 and 46-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,006,893 issued to Gilmore et al. Claims 1, 3, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilmore et al. '893 in view of United States Patent 3,826,353 issued to Greasley. Without acquiescing in the basis for the rejections, the rejected claims are either cancelled or amended to be dependent upon an allowable claim as discussed below. Accordingly, the rejection is moot. Withdrawal is requested.

Allowable Subject Matter.

Claims 4-8, 14-17 and 22-27 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of

Serial No. : 10/707,409
Applicants : Phillip J. Gilmore and Shenghong Yang
Response to : Office Action Mailed 02/03/2006
Page : 9

the base claim and any intervening claims. By this response, claims 4 and 14 are rewritten in independent form. The Examiner is advised that although claims 1 and 14 were previously dependent on claim 40 as base claim, the last paragraph of claim 40 was not incorporated into the rewriting of these dependent claims. The Examiner had previously indicated that the subject matter of claim 40 did not provide patentable weight. Accordingly, the claims were rewritten without this subject matter which is deemed unnecessary for patentability or for antecedent basis of any other term. The remaining claims are dependent upon claim 4 or claim 14 as a base claim and should also be in a condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If Examiner Deuble has any questions or reservations, it is requested that Examiner Deuble call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

PHILLIP J. GILMORE and SHENGHONG YANG

By: Van Dyke, Gardner, Linn
& Burkhardt, LLP

Dated: May 3, 2006.


Frederick S. Burkhardt

Registration No. 29 288
2851 Charlevoix Drive, S.E., Suite 207
Post Office Box 888695
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49588-8695
(616) 988-4104

FSB:djr
RAP04 P-647A